

REMARKS:

Claims 1-17, 19, and 20 remain pending in this application. Claims 1-4, 6-8, and 19, as well as paragraph [0012] of the specification, have been amended. Claims 21-28 have been added. Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS UNDER 37 CFR § 1.84(p)(5)

The Drawings are objected to because elements 14a and 14b are not shown in the Drawings. The Drawings were previously amended to depict the locked and unlocked positions of the present invention in separate figures, thereby eliminating the need for reference numbers 14a and 14b. By this amendment, paragraph [0012] of the specification has been amended to remove reference numbers 14a and 14b and, instead, reference is made generally to the figures. The specification and the drawings are now in concordance with each other. Applicant respectfully submits that the objection to the Drawings is overcome.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(a):

Claims 1, 5-7, and 19 are rejected under 35 USC § 102 based on Koenig (U.S. 6092845). The Examiner contends that Koenig discloses all of the features of the claims, including a cable seat separated from the cable end. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

By this Response, the claims have been amended to clarify that the arrangement of the components is such that, 1) in the locked position of the lock locking device, there is a separation between the cable end and the cable seat; while 2) the locked position of the locking device is achieved by pushing the cable end into contact with the cable seat, using the claim-recited element to do so, and further pushing the cable end to cause displacement of the catch. This releases the rotary bolt. In Koenig, on the other hand, as can be seen in FIG. 1, the cable seat – an end of 82 in contact with the cable 94 according to the Examiner – is continuously coupled

with catch 50 by connector 74. Therefore, in Koenig, connector 74 keeps the cable seat and the cable in constant contact throughout the use of the apparatus and the cable end is never brought “into engagement with the cable seat” as required by Claims 1 and 19. In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.¹

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 2-4, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious based on Koenig in view of Takaishi et al. (U.S. 4691584), on which the Examiner relies for the following features: (1) an element that acts on the end of the cable, which is mechanical, electrical or uses a memory metal; and (2) a mechanical transmission system between the operation device and the cable end. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1, 5-7, and 19.

The undersigned representative requests any extension of time that may be deemed necessary to further the prosecution of this application.

The undersigned representative authorizes the Commissioner to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17 that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 14-1437, referencing Attorney Docket No.: 7574.102.PCUS00.

¹ New claims 21-28 are similar to claim 1 and include the further feature of pushing laterally against the cable end. These claims contain all the limitations of claim 1 and therefore should be allowed for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1, 5-7, and 19.

In order to facilitate the resolution of any issues or questions presented by this paper, the Examiner may directly contact the undersigned by phone to further the discussion.

Novak, Druce & Quigg, LLP
1000 Louisiana, Suite 5300
Houston, Texas 77002
(713) 571-3400
(713) 456-2836 (fax)
tracy.druce@novakdruce.com

Respectfully submitted,



Tracy W. Druce, Esq.
Reg. No. 35,493